

EXHIBIT F

**THIS EXHIBIT HAS BEEN
REDACTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**

EXHIBIT G

**THIS EXHIBIT HAS BEEN
REDACTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**

EXHIBIT H

**THIS EXHIBIT HAS BEEN
REDACTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**

EXHIBIT I

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SRI INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
a California corporation

Plaintiff and
Counterclaim-Defendant,

vs.

CERTIFIED
COPY

Case No. 04-1199 (SLR)

INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
a Delaware corporation; INTERNET
SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., a Georgia
corporation; and SYMANTEC
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Defendants and
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs.

DEPOSITION OF GEORGE KESIDIS
VOLUME I

DATE: May 25, 2006

TIME: 9:13 a.m.

LOCATION: DAY CASEBEER MADRID &
BATCHELDER
20300 Stevens Creek Boulevard
Suite 400
Cupertino, CA 95014

REPORTED BY: KAREN L. BUCHANAN
CSR No. 10772

8696
21416

Bell & Myers

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER, INC.

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I

MAY 25, 2006

Many of the correlation -- what are innately
statistical correlation techniques that are performed
in the network service monitors of the preferred
embodiment can, by proxy, be performed in the
hierarchical monitor the way the preferred embodiment
works, through the code reuse.

Again, at the bottom of -- sorry, the bottom
lines, circa 40 to 46 of column 6:

"Event distribution measures are
useful in correlative analysis
performed by a monitor that receives
reports from other monitors."

And again, by proxy, the nature of that
correlative analysis would be similar in the preferred
embodiment, the kinds of correlations that could play
out in the network service monitor that is described
in detail.

(Reporter interruption.)

THE WITNESS: The actions of the network
service monitors are described in greater detail.

So what that correlative -- what that
correlation in the hierarchical monitor could be by
proxy through the preferred embodiment, by proxy
through the code reuse story in the preferred
embodiment, the similar techniques that are used by

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I**MAY 25, 2006**

1 the network services monitor -- network service 12:50:14
2 monitor. 12:50:14
3 BY MS. MOEHLMAN: 12:51:03
4 Q. Anything else? 12:51:04
5 A. I think that's it. 12:51:04
6 Q. Is there any description in the patent of 12:51:08
7 how to apply a the statistical algorithm to the 12:51:08
8 reports generated by, as you call them, the network 12:51:10
9 service monitors? 12:51:10
10 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and 12:51:41
11 ambiguous. 12:51:41
12 THE WITNESS: How to apply a statistical 12:51:44
13 algorithm? 12:51:47
14 The details in the specification of the 12:51:53
15 patent regarding the processing of reports of 12:52:01
16 suspicious activity and issuing meta alerts are much 12:52:06
17 less than the corresponding descriptions of the 12:52:12
18 internal operations of a network service monitor. 12:52:16
19 There isn't as much detail. 12:52:21
20 My opinion is that in the preferred 12:52:30
21 embodiment, they are relying on the code reuse 12:52:42
22 strategy and, therefore, are fleshing out a lot of 12:52:47
23 details at one level of the hierarchy, that is to say 12:52:51
24 the network service monitor, and a lot of the 12:52:55
25 techniques that could be used at the second level of

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I**MAY 25, 2006**

the hierarchy, the hierarchical monitor or domain monitor, are not given.

MS. MOEHLMAN:

Q. Would one of skill in the art understand how they could take the algorithms described in the patent and use them for a hierarchical monitor?

A. I believe so, yes.

Q. How, for example, would you take the signature engines and build a hierarchical monitor using a signature engine?

MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.

THE WITNESS: For example, you might be interested in determining the prevalence of a certain kind of attack, a packet that's malformed in a certain way it may trigger a signature alert at the lowest level of the hierarchy, either one or a group of packets might. And the hierarchical monitor might be interested in similar kind of alerts occurring not only in the one domain I just mentioned but in multiple domains.

So the application of the same signature, of course, wouldn't -- you wouldn't apply the same signature at the hierarchical level, because you're not looking at packet traffic directly. But you would

12:53:00

12:53:07

12:53:14

12:53:21

12:53:28

12:53:35

12:53:42

12:53:49

12:53:57

12:53:59

12:53:57

12:53:44

12:53:49

12:53:56

12:54:11

12:54:14

12:54:18

12:54:25

12:54:32

12:54:36

12:54:38

12:54:45

12:54:49

12:54:52

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I**MAY 25, 2006**

simply temporally and spatially correlate similar --
similar kinds of alerts that were triggered by similar
kinds of signatures, and that might be indicative of a
more diffuse attack that's targeting larger swaths of
the network rather than just one domain or one
workstation.

MS. MOEHLMAN:

Q. Is there anything in this patent
specification that discloses examples of where a
hierarchical monitor using a signature engine could
be used?

A. An example, a specific example of a
hierarchical monitor, the specific functioning of a
hierarchical monitor is not directly given, I don't
think, in the patent spec. By that, I specifically
mean a specific instance of how -- for example, in the
case of signatures, how a service monitor that's
detecting signatures, how it passes signature-based
alerts to hierarchy monitors and what specifically the
hierarchical monitor would do with such signature
alerts. That example is not explored in the spec.

Q. In the November of 1998 time frame, was it
commonly known how one would implement hierarchical
correlation of alerts from lower level monitors?

MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I**MAY 25, 2006**

1 ambiguous, lacks foundation.

2 THE WITNESS: Asked in a broad sense, there
 3 were proposals in the prior art on hierarchical
 4 monitors. That were hierarchical monitor in the prior
 5 art that were employed in what I would say are
 6 different contexts using different techniques and did
 7 do hierarchical correlation.

8 BY MS. MOEHLMAN:

9 Q. Would those apply to this context, the
 10 context of the patent?

11 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and
 12 ambiguous.

13 THE WITNESS: I'm just a bit uncomfortable
 14 talking about such generalities. If you want to talk
 15 about specifically, for example, gRIDS or another
 16 piece of prior art that's been called out, we can
 17 explore that in detail. But I'd rather explore it in
 18 the detail of specific prior art rather than answer
 19 the question so generally.

20 BY MS. MOEHLMAN:

21 Q. So then there wasn't commonly known
 22 techniques in the art in November of 1998 that
 23 implemented hierarchical correlation, correct?

24 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Mischaracterizes,
 25 vague and ambiguous.

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I

MAY 25, 2006

1	THE WITNESS: There wasn't commonly known techniques?	12:58:55
2	BY MS. MOEHLMAN:	12:58:10
3	Q. I'll ask it in the positive way to make it clear. Were there commonly known techniques in the	12:58:15
4	art, in the intrusion detection field, in November of	12:58:16
5	1998 that implemented hierarchical correlation?	12:58:20
6	A. In this context? No. I don't believe there	12:58:25
7	were.	12:59:01
8	Q. With respect to grIDS, do you believe the	12:59:06
9	hierarchical correlation techniques described in	12:59:09
10	grIDS would be applicable to the subject matter of	12:59:12
11	the '615 patent?	12:59:13
12	MR. POLLACK: Objection. Lacks foundation,	12:59:16
13	vague and ambiguous.	12:59:17
14	THE WITNESS: In my rebuttal to -- on	12:59:20
15	validity, I basically say no. And I stand by that. I	12:59:25
16	don't think grIDS -- I don't think grIDS discloses a	12:59:34
17	hierarchical monitor in this context.	12:59:34
18	BY MS. MOEHLMAN:	12:59:35
19	Q. Do you believe that the correlation	12:59:37
20	techniques that were used in grIDS at a hierarchical	12:59:41
21	level would be applicable to hierarchical analysis by	12:59:45
22	higher level monitors disclosed in the '615 patent?	12:59:48
23	MR. POLLACK: Objection. Lacks foundation,	

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I

MAY 25, 2006

1 the dependent claim correlating underlying
 2 commonalities.

3 The second point is that, depending on the
 4 kind of attack, you may integrate reports that don't
 5 have common attributes. For example, certain
 6 attributes that are indicative of an attack are --
 7 you're looking at a dispersion of the attribute rather
 8 than a concentration. Like a scanning worm, for
 9 example, will have a dispersed field in the
 10 destination addresses rather than a focused field.

11 Also, you could have certain kind of
 12 suspicious activities that are related but are
 13 components of a larger attack. You could have a decoy
 14 attack that could be followed by the real or the truly
 15 intended attack. And the decoy's objective could be
 16 to try to preoccupy the defenses or soften a defense
 17 or soften a resource that will ultimately be
 18 compromised by the second or third attack that's
 19 forthcoming.

20 Q. Is there a difference -- you used the term
 21 "aggregation. Is there a difference between the term
 22 "aggregation" and "integration"?

23 A. I think that -- the word "aggregation." So
 24 the word "aggregation" could have a very trivial
 25 meaning, that you're essentially looking at, for

17:35:00

17:35:03

17:35:08

17:35:11

17:35:14

17:35:17

17:35:20

17:35:23

17:35:26

17:35:29

17:35:32

17:35:35

17:35:38

17:35:41

17:35:44

17:35:47

17:35:50

17:35:53

17:35:56

17:35:59

17:35:02

17:35:05

17:35:08

17:35:11

17:35:16

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I

MAY 25, 2006

example, identical reports and counting how many identical reports you receive. And I don't think that's the intent of the term "integrating" or "correlating."

I think "correlating" connotes something that's somewhat more -- significantly more sophisticated kind of grouping. That's another word I'm using that -- common usage, integrating, correlating, grouping, aggregating all potentially could refer to the same function, but I think the meaning in the last element of claim 1 is something that's significantly more sophisticated, and in claim 2, than simply counting identical reports.

Q. Now, you said you believe correlating has a statistical meaning. What did you mean by that?

A. The word "correlation" is a well-defined statistical term.

Q. And do you believe that that's what is meant by "correlation" in claim 2?

MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.

THE WITNESS: I don't think in this particular claim that there is necessarily a statistical meaning breathed into the word "correlation." I think that in this particular claim,

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME I

MAY 25, 2006

1 It's using the word "integrating," it's using the word 17:37:15
 2 "correlating," tying it to the word "commonality" as a 17:37:16
 3 kind of integration where you're looking for 17:37:18
 4 commonalities, and it's saying for that kind of 17:37:20
 5 integration, I'm going to use the word "correlating" 17:37:26
 6 to connote integration that involves commonalities. 17:37:30

7 And that's inspired -- I think that 17:37:35
 8 interpretation is inspired by the formal definition of 17:37:40
 9 the notion of a correlation in a statistical sense 17:37:44
 10 where you're looking for commonalities of random 17:37:46
 11 quantities. So I don't think this massage is 17:37:51
 12 necessarily about random quantities, but it's simply 17:37:55
 13 using -- it's simply using the word "correlating" when 17:37:59
 14 you're integrating based on commonalities. 17:37:59

15 BY MS. MOEHLMAN: 17:38:02

16 Q. Is one commonality the same source address? 17:38:08

17 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and 17:38:11
 18 ambiguous. 17:38:13

19 THE WITNESS: It possibly could be the same 17:38:15
 20 source address. 17:38:15

21 BY MS. MOEHLMAN: 17:38:17

22 Q. So if -- if a -- 17:38:21

23 A. As an absolute question, or are you saying in 17:38:25
 24 the context of this claim, that a commonality could be 17:38:28
 25 the same --

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SRI INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
a California corporation,

Plaintiff and
Counterclaim-Defendant,

vs.

CERTIFIED
6/27

CASE NO: 04-1199 (SIR)

INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
a Delaware corporation; INTERNET
SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., a Georgia
corporation; and SYMANTEC
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Defendants and
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs.

DEPOSITION OF GEORGE KESIDIS
VOLUME II

DATE: Friday, May 26, 2006

TIME: 9:00 A.M.

LOCATION: DAY, CASEBEER, MADRID &
BATCHELDER
20300 Stevens Creek Boulevard
Suite 400
Cupertino, CA 95014

REPORTER: Patricia Hope Sales, CRR
CSR License Number C-4423

8705
21418

Bell & Myers

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER, INC.

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME II

MAY 26, 2006

	Afternoon Session	1:02 P.M.	13:01:31
	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record.		13:01:32
	The time is 1:02 P.M.		13:01:33
	BY MS. MOEHLMAN:		13:01:41
	Q. Professor Kesidis, is the term "statistical description" a term of art in the field of statistics?		13:01:41
	MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.		13:01:48
	THE WITNESS: A rather broad term, but -- (nods head).		13:01:50
	BY MS. MOEHLMAN:		13:01:55
	Q. What would it mean to one in the field of statistics?		13:01:55
	MR. POLLACK: Same objection.		13:01:59
	THE WITNESS: A statistic is a -- is -- is formed by a sampling of a -- of instances of a random quantity. So there is a -- a random quantity that you are observing, and -- or sampling, and you are -- based on those samples, you are computing another quantity, and you refer to that as a "statistic."		13:02:06
	BY MS. MOEHLMAN:		13:02:52
	Q. Okay. What is a "statistical description"?		13:02:57
	MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.		13:03:07
	THE WITNESS: Well, that could be a variety of different things.		13:03:07
			13:03:08

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME II

MAY 26, 2006

	If for example, I -- I know -- if -- if I know that the -- the quantity that I'm monitoring has a -- a distribution that can be parameterized, say, by a single mean and a -- and a standard deviation, then the statistical description could be an estimate of the distribution, it could be an estimate of the mean, it could be an estimate of the standard deviation, for example.	13:03:13 13:03:17 13:03:29 13:03:35 13:03:41 13:03:44 13:03:46 13:03:52 13:04:13
9	BY MS. MOEHLMAN:	13:04:13
10	Q. What if you assume -- you make no assumptions about parametric -- parametric distribution of the data?	13:04:13 13:04:18
11	What would "statistical description" mean then?	13:04:23
12	MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and ambiguous, lacks foundation.	13:04:27 13:04:28
13	THE WITNESS: Could you repeat that -- that expression, "parametric" -- I'm sorry -- "parametric distribution of the data"?	13:04:29 13:04:31 13:04:36
14	BY MS. MOEHLMAN:	13:04:37
15	Q. Yeah. Do you understand that to -- what do you understand that to mean?	13:04:37 13:04:38
16	MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.	13:04:40
17	THE WITNESS: Could you just point out where in the spec you are -- you are reading?	13:04:43 13:04:45
18	BY MS. MOEHLMAN:	13:04:46
19	Q. Column six of the '338 patent, fifty-five.	13:04:46

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SRI INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
a California corporation

Plaintiff and
Counterclaim-Defendant,

vs.

CERTIFIED
COPY

Case No. 04-1199 (SLR)

INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
a Delaware corporation; INTERNET
SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., a Georgia
corporation; and SYMANTEC
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Defendants and
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs

DEPOSITION OF GEORGE KESIDIS
VOLUME III

DATE: May 29, 2006

TIME: 9:00 a.m.

LOCATION: DAY CASEBEER MADRID & BATCHELDER
20300 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 400
Cupertino, CA 95014

REPORTED BY: KAREN L. BUCHANAN, CSR No. 10772

8714
21420

Bell & Myers

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER, INC.

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME III

MAY 29, 2006

1 A. I have it. 09:03:11

2 Q. And I'd like to ask you before we dive into 09:03:13
 3 the report if you could explain to me in your opinion 09:03:15
 4 the distinction between the claim term "statistical 09:03:17
 5 detection method" and "signature detection method." 09:03:19
 6 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Overly broad, vague 09:03:20
 7 and ambiguous. 09:03:21

8 THE WITNESS: I believe a signature detection 09:03:25
 9 method is one that involves a condition that's checked 09:03:27
 10 and the result is a certainty that the associated 09:03:29
 11 alert is to be fired. So I view a certain amount of 09:03:31
 12 determinism in a signature detection method. 09:03:33

13 BY MR. GALVIN: 09:03:50

14 Q. And how would you compare that or contrast 09:04:06
 15 that with a statistical detection method? 09:04:10

16 MR. POLLACK: Same objections. 09:04:13

17 THE WITNESS: I mean very generally speaking, 09:04:14
 18 a statistical detection method is one in which there 09:04:16
 19 is a possibility of a false positive or negative -- or 09:04:19
 20 false negative in the alert that is generated. 09:04:28

21 BY MR. GALVIN: 09:04:28

22 Q. Would you say that there is no possibility 09:04:33
 23 of a false positive or false negative with the 09:04:36
 24 signature detection method? 09:04:46

25 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and 09:04:48

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME III

MAY 29, 2006

1 ambiguous.

09:04:19

2 THE WITNESS: Can you give me a specific
 3 example? I'm thinking that some -- some signatures as
 4 crafted are -- to my mind, they may be called
 5 signatures, and the alert that's generated is assumed
 6 to be certain. But someone could interpret that rule,
 7 a given signature rule and say that the rule could
 8 trip unintentionally. So there is a gray area, I
 9 think, between the two definitions. That was the
 10 reason why I'm just qualifying my statements, speaking
 11 very generally.

09:04:26

09:04:31

09:05:07

09:05:14

09:05:21

09:05:28

09:05:35

09:05:42

09:05:47

09:05:54

09:05:59

12 BY MR. GALVIN:

09:05:59

13 Q. Given that gray area, how would one skilled
 14 in the art reading the patent specifications and the
 15 patent claims be able to determine whether a
 16 particular technique was a claimed statistical
 17 detection method as opposed to something other than a
 18 statistical detection method, like a signature
 19 detection method?

09:06:00

09:06:10

09:06:13

09:06:16

09:06:18

09:06:23

09:06:25

20 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and
 21 ambiguous, lacks foundation.

09:06:26

09:06:27

22 THE WITNESS: Again, speaking very broadly,
 23 if you're trying to detect anomalies, the implication
 24 being that it's something, you know, detecting an
 25 event that is suspicious and abnormal, an attack, for

09:06:31

09:06:36

09:06:44

09:06:50

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME III

MAY 29, 2006

1 example, a specific attack that has not yet been seen
 2 or observed before, that to my mind may involve
 3 statistical techniques.

4 So I -- because characterizing what's normal
 5 in the deployment context of the SRI inventions is
 6 very challenging, one is left with a statistical
 7 approach to characterizing what's abnormal, therefore.

8 BY MR. GALVIN:

9 Q. Can you give me some examples of signature
 10 detection methods that were known as of November
 11 1998?

12 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and
 13 ambiguous.

14 THE WITNESS: There may be -- for example,
 15 there may be malformed fields, excessively long fields
 16 that are provided in the -- say, the establishment of
 17 on FTP session. So a field may be, say, excessively
 18 longer than what ought to be expected, and that may
 19 trip an alert in and of itself, no other information
 20 required.

21 There could be also -- there could be, the
 22 other opposite extreme, a packet that is abbreviated,
 23 a runt packet, for example, that may trip a signature.

24 So essentially the two examples I'm giving
 25 are one wherein you could examine a packet whose

09:06:36

09:07:52

09:07:06

09:07:13

09:07:17

09:07:25

09:07:33

09:07:37

09:07:38

09:07:44

09:07:49

09:07:49

09:07:50

09:07:56

09:08:06

09:08:14

09:08:20

09:08:33

09:08:37

09:08:42

09:08:47

09:09:02

09:09:07

09:09:17

09:09:21

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME III

MAY 29, 2006

1 intention is known and that the -- very simple checks
 2 are conducted on the packet's content and header to
 3 make sure -- and I mean the examples I'm giving are
 4 quite simple, that the information provided by the
 5 packet and the format of the packet are consistent
 6 with the standard of the protocol that's in play.

7 BY MR. GALVIN:

8 Q. If you could turn to the '338 patent,
 9 Exhibit 4.

10 A. Okay. I have it.

11 Q. Column 7, around line 22.

12 A. Okay.

13 Q. The paragraph that begins:

14 "As shown, the monitor 16 also
 15 includes a signature engine 24. The
 16 signature engine 24 maps an event
 17 stream against abstract
 18 representations of event sequences
 19 that are known to indicate undesirable
 20 activity."

21 Would you agree that a signature detection
 22 method compares observed network traffic data to known
 23 patterns?

24 A. Would you just remind me what figure this is
 25 referring to so that -- monitor 16 --

09:09:15

09:09:32

09:09:36

09:09:41

09:09:43

09:09:45

09:09:46

09:09:47

09:09:53

09:09:54

09:10:10

09:10:11

09:10:12

09:10:15

09:10:18

09:10:21

09:10:23

09:10:25

09:10:30

09:10:37

09:10:40

09:10:48

09:10:48

09:10:51

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME III

MAY 29, 2006

1 Q. I believe it was figure 7.

2 A. Okay. Oh, it's the -- okay. Sorry, can you
3 repeat your last question?

4 Q. Sure. Would you agree that a signature
5 detection method compares observed network traffic
6 data to known patterns indicating undesirable
7 activity?

8 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and
9 ambiguous.

10 THE WITNESS: Sure.

11 BY MR. GALVIN:

12 Q. Is it a requirement of a signature detection
13 method that the signature be previously known?

14 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and
15 ambiguous.

16 THE WITNESS: I think that -- my
17 interpretation of signature is that it's known, yes.

18 BY MR. GALVIN:

19 Q. And would you use that as a basis for
20 distinguishing -- one basis for distinguishing
21 between a signature detection method and a
22 statistical detection method in that a statistical
23 detection method may be capable of identifying
24 suspicious activity that had not been previously
25 observed?

09:10:17

09:10:17

09:11:11

09:11:11

09:11:11

09:11:11

09:11:11

09:11:24

09:11:25

09:11:26

09:11:27

09:11:27

09:11:46

09:11:41

09:11:49

09:11:49

09:12:01

09:12:00

09:12:09

09:12:12

09:12:15

09:12:18

09:12:21

09:12:24

09:12:28

09:12:32

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME III MAY 29, 2006

1 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and
2 ambiguous.

3 THE WITNESS: Yes, I would agree with that,
4 yeah, generally speaking.

5 BY MR. GALVIN:

6 Q. If you continue down on column 7 of the '338
7 patent, around line 46, there is a sentence that is
8 describing:

9 "Threshold analysis is a
10 rudimentary, inexpensive signature
11 analysis technique that records the
12 occurrence of specific events and, as
13 the name implies, detects when the
14 number of occurrences of that event
15 surpasses a reasonable count."

16 Do you agree that in the context of the
17 patents in suit that a threshold analysis is a
18 signature detection method technique and not a
19 statistical detection method?

20 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and
21 ambiguous, asked and answered.

22 THE WITNESS: I -- in the context of --
23 you're saying that any technique that employs a
24 threshold? Is that what you're asking?

25 BY MR. GALVIN:

09:12:41

09:12:42

09:12:43

09:12:44

09:12:45

09:12:46

09:12:47

09:12:48

09:12:49

09:12:50

09:12:51

09:12:52

09:12:53

09:12:54

09:12:55

09:12:56

09:12:57

09:12:58

09:12:59

09:12:40

09:12:41

09:12:42

09:12:43

09:12:44

09:12:45

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME III

MAY 29, 2006

1 network service monitors?

10:44:00

2 MR. POLLACK: Objection. Lacks foundation,
3 vague and ambiguous.

10:44:01

4 THE WITNESS: I never looked at the code with
5 the objective of trying to corroborate whether a
6 specific technique was reused or whether the
7 architecture of figure 2 was in play. So given
8 that -- so I have a qualified answer that I didn't
9 observe that mCorr code had the same architecture that
10 an EMERALD sensor had. But as to whether specific
11 statistical techniques were employed, again, I didn't
12 look at the code with that in mind to verify.

10:44:02

10:44:03

10:44:04

10:44:05

10:44:06

10:44:07

10:44:08

10:44:09

10:44:10

10:44:11

10:44:12

10:44:13

10:44:14

10:44:15

10:44:16

10:44:17

10:44:18

10:44:19

10:44:20

10:44:21

10:44:22

10:44:23

10:44:24

10:44:25

10:44:26

10:44:27

10:44:28

10:44:29

10:44:30

10:44:31

10:44:32

10:44:33

10:44:34

10:44:35

10:44:36

10:44:37

10:44:38

10:44:39

10:44:40

10:44:41

10:44:42

10:44:43

10:44:44

10:44:45

10:44:46

10:44:47

10:44:48

10:44:49

10:44:50

10:44:51

10:44:52

10:44:53

10:44:54

13 BY MR. GALVIN:

10:45:03

14 Q. But is it your opinion that one skilled in
15 the art reading the specification would have
16 understood the specification to teach that a common
17 code base would be used in the network service
18 monitors and the network hierarchical monitors?

10:45:04

10:45:08

10:45:09

10:45:10

10:45:11

10:45:12

10:45:13

10:45:14

10:45:15

10:45:16

10:45:17

10:45:18

10:45:19

10:45:20

10:45:21

10:45:22

10:45:23

10:45:24

10:45:25

10:45:26

10:45:27

10:45:28

10:45:29

10:45:30

10:45:31

10:45:32

10:45:33

10:45:34

10:45:35

10:45:36

10:45:37

10:45:38

23 BY MR. GALVIN:

10:45:47

24 Q. The entirety of the specification, including
25 figure 2.

10:45:48

10:45:51

10:45:52

10:45:53

10:45:54

10:45:55

10:45:56

10:45:57

10:45:58

10:45:59

10:45:60

GEORGE KESIDIS, VOLUME III

MAY 29, 2006

	MR. POLLACK: Same objections.	10:45:47
1	THE WITNESS: Architecturally, the patent	10:46:03
2	specification does teach using the same general	10:46:05
3	architecture for the hierarchical monitors as it does	10:46:09
4	for the network service monitor.	10:46:15
5	BY MR. GALVIN:	10:46:15
6	Q. Including the same engines?	10:46:18
7	MR. POLLACK: Vague and ambiguous --	10:46:18
8	objection. Vague and ambiguous.	10:46:20
9	THE WITNESS: To be honest with you, I'm not	10:46:21
10	sure what that means. You mean exactly the same code?	10:46:23
11	I'm not sure what you mean by engines.	10:46:34
12	BY MR. GALVIN:	10:46:34
13	Q. Figure 2 depicts two analysis engines,	10:46:36
14	correct?	10:46:39
15	A. That's correct, yes.	10:46:39
16	Q. And the specification teaches that monitors	10:46:40
17	contain one or more analysis engines, correct?	10:46:43
18	A. Okay.	10:46:46
19	MR. POLLACK: Objection. Vague and	10:46:46
20	ambiguous, languages foundation, document speaks for	10:46:48
21	itself.	10:46:52
22	THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.	10:46:52
23	BY MR. GALVIN:	10:46:52
24	Q. Is it therefore your opinion that the	10:46:53

EXHIBIT J

EMERALD: Event Monitoring Enabling Responses to Anomalous Live Disturbances †

Phillip A. Porras and Peter G. Neumann
porras@csl.sri.com and neumann@csl.sri.com
<http://www.csl.sri.com/intrusion.html>

Computer Science Laboratory
SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025-3493

Abstract— The EMERALD (Event Monitoring Enabling Responses to Anomalous Live Disturbances) environment is a distributed scalable tool suite for tracking malicious activity through and across large networks. EMERALD introduces a highly distributed, building-block approach to network surveillance, attack isolation, and automated response. It combines models from research in distributed high-volume event-correlation methodologies with over a decade of intrusion detection research and engineering experience. The approach is novel in its use of highly distributed, independently tunable, surveillance and response monitors that are deployable polymorphically at various abstract layers in a large network. These monitors contribute to a streamlined event-analysis system that combines signature analysis with statistical profiling to provide localized real-time protection of the most widely used network services on the Internet. Equally important, EMERALD introduces a recursive framework for coordinating the dissemination of analyses from the distributed monitors to provide a global detection and response capability that can counter attacks occurring across an entire network enterprise. Further, EMERALD introduces a versatile application programmers' interface that enhances its ability to integrate with heterogeneous target hosts and provides a high degree of interoperability with third-party tool suites.

Keywords— Network security, intrusion detection, coordinated attacks, anomaly detection, misuse detection, information warfare, system survivability, insider threat, outsider threat.

I. INTRODUCTION

Our infrastructures of highly integrated information systems, both military and commercial, have become one of the key assets on which we depend for competitive advantage. These information infrastructures tend to be conglomerates of integrated commercial-off-

† The work described here is currently funded by DARPA/ITO under contract number F30602-98-C-0294.

the-shelf (COTS) and non-COTS components, interoperating and sharing information at increasing levels of demand and capacity. These systems are relied on to manage a growing list of needs including transportation, commerce, energy management, communications, and defense.

Unfortunately, the very interoperability and sophisticated integration of technology that make our infrastructures such valuable assets also make them vulnerable to attack, and make our dependence on our infrastructures a potential liability. We have had ample opportunity to consider numerous examples of vulnerabilities and attacks against our infrastructures and the systems that use them. Attacks such as the Internet worm [21], [23] have shown us how our interconnectivity across large domains can be used against us to spread malicious code. Accidental outages such as the 1980 ARPAnet collapse [22] and the 1990 AT&T collapse [17] illustrate how seemingly localized triggering events can have globally disastrous effects on widely distributed systems. In addition, we have witnessed organized groups of miscreants [11], [17], local and foreign, performing malicious and coordinated attacks against varieties of online targets. We are keenly aware of the recurring examples of vulnerabilities that exist pervasively in network services, protocols, and operating systems, throughout our military and commercial network infrastructures. Even the deployment of newer more robust technologies does not fully compensate for the vulnerabilities in the multitude of legacy systems with which the newer systems must interoperate.

Yet, despite these examples, there remain no widely available robust tools to allow us to track malicious activity through and across large networks. The need for scalable network-aware surveillance and response technologies continues to grow.

II. CHALLENGES TO SCALABLE NETWORK MISUSE DETECTION

As dependence on our network infrastructures continues to grow, so too grows our need to ensure the survivability of these assets. Investments into scalable network intrusion detection¹ will over time offer an important additional dimension to the survivability of our infrastructures. Mechanisms are needed to provide real-time detection of patterns in network operations that may indicate anomalous or malicious activity, and to respond to this activity through automated countermeasures. In addition, these mechanisms should also support the pursuit of individuals responsible for malicious activity through the collection and correlation of event data.

The typical target environment of the EMERALD project is a large enterprise network with thousands of users connected in a federation of independent administrative domains. Each administrative domain is viewed as a collection of local and network services that provide an interface for requests from individuals internal and external to the domain. Network services include features common to many network operating systems such as mail, HTTP, FTP, remote login, network file systems, finger, Kerberos, and SNMP. Some domains may share trust relationships with other domains (either peer-to-peer or hierarchical). Other domains may operate in complete mistrust of all others, providing outgoing connections only, perhaps severely restricting incoming connections. Users may be local to a single domain or may possess accounts on multiple domains that allow them to freely establish connections throughout the enterprise.

In the environment of an enterprise network, well-established concepts in computer security such as the reference monitor [3] do not apply well. A large enterprise network is a dynamic cooperative of interconnected heterogeneous systems that often exists more through co-dependence than hierarchical structure. Defining a single security policy over such an enterprise, let alone a single point of authority, is often not practical.

With traditional approaches to security being difficult to apply to network infrastructures in the large, the need to ensure survivability of these infrastructures raises important questions. One such question is, "Can we build surveillance and response capabilities that can scale to very large enterprise networks?" To do so will require us to overcome a number of challenges in cur-

¹ In this paper, the term "invasion" is used broadly to encompass misuse, anomalies, service denials, and other deviations from acceptable system behavior.

rent intrusion-detection designs, many of which derive from the centralized paradigm of current architectures. While a fully distributed architecture could address some of these challenges, it too introduces tradeoffs in capabilities and performance. The following briefly summarizes challenges that exist in scaling intrusion-detection tools to large networks.

- **Event Generation and Storage:** Audit generation and storage has tended to be a centralized activity, and often gathers excessive amounts of information at inappropriate layers of abstraction. Centralized audit mechanisms place a heavy burden on the CPU and I/O throughput, and simply do not scale well with large user populations. In addition, it is difficult to extend centralized audit mechanisms to cover spatially distributed components such as network infrastructure (e.g., routers, filters, DNS, firewalls) or various common network services.

- **State-space Management and Rule Complexity:** In signature-based analyses, rule complexity can have a direct tradeoff with performance. A sophisticated rule structure able to represent complex/multiple event orderings with elaborate pre- or post-conditions may allow for very concise and well-structured penetration definitions. However, sophisticated rule structures may also impose heavy burdens in maintaining greater amounts of state information throughout the analysis, limiting their scalability to environments with high volumes of events. Shorter and simpler rules may impose lesser analysis and state-management burdens, helping to provide greater scalability and efficiency in event analysis. When speed is the key issue, the ultimate rule-set is one with no state-management needs — requiring no ordering and no time-consuming pre- and post-conditions to evaluate as events are processed. Simpler rules, however, also limit expressibility in misuse definitions, and can lead to inflated rule-bases to compensate for a single complex rule-set that might cover many variations of an attack. Clearly, there exists a tradeoff between highly complex and expressibly rich rule models versus shorter and simpler rules that individually require minimal state-management and analysis burdens.

- **Knowledge Repositories:** Expert systems separate their base of knowledge (rules of inference and state information regarding the target system) from both their analysis code and response logic in an effort to add to their overall modularity. There is some advantage to maintaining this knowledge base in a centrally located repository. Dynamic modification and control over this information is made easier when only single repositories need be modified. A centrally located knowledge repository is efficient for making pluggable rule-sets that add

to the generality and portability of the tool. However, in a highly distributed and high-volume event environment, a single repository combined with a single analysis engine can act as a choke-point. It also provides a single point of failure should the repository become unavailable or tainted.

- **Inference Architectures:** At the core of many signature-based expert systems exists an algorithm for accepting the input (in our case activity logs) and, based on a set of inference rules, directing the search for new information. This inference-engine model is very centralized in nature. In a large network, events and data flow asynchronously throughout the network in parallel and in volumes beyond what any centralized analysis technologies can process. A central analysis requires centralized collection of event information, and imposes the full burden (I/O, processing, and memory) of the analysis on those components on which the inference engine resides. This single-point-of-analysis model does not scale well. A completely distributed analysis, however, introduces its own challenges. Both global correlation and intelligent coordination among distributed analysis units impose significant resource overhead. Finding the optimal analysis paradigm between the continuum of the centralized expert-system approach and a fully decentralized analysis schema is a key challenge in building a scalable inference architecture.

The physical and logical dispersion of the interfaces and controls among target systems and networks must be accommodated by the architecture of the distributed analysis system. Centralized intrusion-detection architectures deployed in highly distributed network environments experience difficulty in integrating and scaling their analysis paradigms to such environments. (Several of these issues are explored in [16]). The issues and limitation discussed above represent challenges to the very design and engineering assumptions on which much of the current intrusion-detection research is based.

The objective of the EMERALD work is to bring a collection of research and prototype development efforts into the practical world, in such a way that the analysis tools for detecting and interpreting anomalies and misuses can be applied and integrated into realistic network computing environments. The EMERALD project provides a critical step in demonstrating how to construct scalable and computationally realistic intrusion-detection mechanisms to track malicious activity within and across large networks. To do this, EMERALD employs detection and response components that are smaller and more distributed than previous intrusion-detection efforts, and that interoperate to provide composable surveillance.

EMERALD represents a significant departure from previous centralized host-based, user-oriented, intrusion-detection efforts that suffer poor scalability and integration into large networks. EMERALD's analysis scheme targets the external threat agent who attempts to subvert or bypass a domain's network interfaces and control mechanisms to gain unauthorized access to domain resources or prevent the availability of these resources. EMERALD employs a building-block architectural strategy using independent distributed surveillance monitors that can analyze and respond to malicious activity on local targets, and can interoperate to form an analysis hierarchy. This layered analysis hierarchy provides a framework for the recognition of more global threats to interdomain connectivity, including coordinated attempts to infiltrate or destroy connectivity across an entire network enterprise. Section III presents an architectural overview of EMERALD, and Section IV discusses its integration into distributed computing environments.

III. THE EMERALD NETWORK INTRUSION DETECTION ARCHITECTURE

EMERALD introduces a hierarchically layered approach to network surveillance that includes service analysis covering the misuse of individual components and network services within the boundary of a single domain; domain-wide analysis covering misuse visible across multiple services and components; and enterprise-wide analysis covering coordinated misuse across multiple domains. The objective of the service analysis is to streamline and decentralize the surveillance of a domain's network interfaces for activity that may indicate misuse or significant anomalies in operation. We introduce the concept of dynamically deployable, highly distributed, and independently tunable service monitors. Service monitors are dynamically deployed within a domain to provide localized real-time analysis of infrastructure (e.g., routers or gateways) and services (privileged subsystems with network interfaces). Service monitors may interact with their environment passively (reading activity logs) or actively via probing to supplement normal event gathering. This localized coverage of network services and domain infrastructure forms the lowest tier in EMERALD's layered network-monitoring schema.

Information correlated by a service monitor can be disseminated to other EMERALD monitors through a subscription-based communication scheme. Subscription provides EMERALD's message system both a push and pull data exchange capability between monitor interoperation (see Section III-F). EMERALD client monitors are able to subscribe to receive the analysis

results that are produced by server monitors. As a monitor produces analysis results, it is then able to disseminate these results asynchronously to its client subscribers. Through subscription, EMERALD monitors distributed throughout a large network are able to efficiently disseminate reports of malicious activity without requiring the overhead of synchronous polling.

Domain-wide analysis forms the second tier of EMERALD's layered network surveillance scheme. A *domain monitor* is responsible for surveillance over all or part of the domain. *Domain monitors* correlate intrusion reports disseminated by individual service monitors, providing a domain-wide perspective of malicious activity (or patterns of activity). In addition to domain surveillance, the domain monitor is responsible for reconfiguring system parameters, interfacing with other monitors beyond the domain, and reporting threats against the domain to administrators.

Lastly, EMERALD enables enterprise-wide analysis, providing a global abstraction of the cooperative community of domains. Enterprise-layer monitors correlate activity reports produced across the set of monitored domains. Enterprise-layer monitors focus on network-wide threats such as Internet worm-like attacks, attacks repeated against common network services across domains, and coordinated attacks from multiple domains against a single domain. Through this correlation and sharing of analysis results, reports of problems found by one monitor may propagate to other monitors throughout the network. The enterprise itself need not be stable in its configuration or centrally administered. Rather, it may exist as an emergent entity through the interconnections of the domains. EMERALD's ability to perform interdomain event analysis is vital to addressing more global, information warfare-like attacks against the entire enterprise (see Section IV).

A. The EMERALD Monitor

The generic EMERALD monitor architecture is illustrated in Figure 1. The architecture is designed to enable the flexible introduction and deletion of analysis engines from the monitor boundary as necessary. In its dual-analysis configuration, an EMERALD monitor instantiation combines signature analysis with statistical profiling to provide complementary forms of analysis over the operation of network services and infrastructure. In general, a monitor may include additional analysis engines that may implement other forms of event analysis, or a monitor may consist of only a single resolver implementing a response policy based on intrusion summaries produced by other EMERALD monitors. Monitors also incorporate a versatile application programmers' interface that enhances their ability to

interoperate with the analysis target, and with other third-party intrusion-detection tools.

Underlying the deployment of an EMERALD monitor is the selection of a target-specific event stream. The event stream may be derived from a variety of sources including audit data, network datagrams, SNMP traffic, application logs, and analysis results from other intrusion-detection instrumentation. The event stream is parsed, filtered, and formatted by the target-specific event-collection methods provided within the resource object definition (see Section III-B). Event records are then forwarded to the monitor's analysis engine(s) for processing.

EMERALD's profiler engine performs statistical profile-based anomaly detection given a generalized event stream of an analysis target (Section III-C). EMERALD's signature engine requires minimal state-management and employs a rule-coding scheme that breaks from traditional expert-system techniques to provide a more focused and distributed signature-analysis model (Section III-D). Multiple analysis engines implementing different analysis methods may be employed to analyze a variety of event streams that pertain to the same analysis target. These analysis engines are intended to develop significantly lower volumes of abstract intrusion or suspicion reports. The profiler and signature engines receive large volumes of event logs specific to the analysis target, and produce smaller volumes of intrusion or suspicion reports that are then fed to their associated resolver.

EMERALD's resolver is the coordinator of analysis reports and the implementor of the "response policy" (Section III-E). A resolver may correlate analysis results produced externally by other analysis engines to which it subscribes, and it may be bound to one or more analysis engines within the monitor boundary. Because the volume of its input is much lower than the event-stream volumes processed by the analysis engines, the resolver is able to implement sophisticated management and control policies over the analysis engines. The resolver also provides the primary interface between its associated analysis engines, the analysis target, and other intrusion-detection modules. In general, monitors may exist with multiple analysis engines, and support the capability to interoperate with third-party analysis engines.

At the center of the EMERALD monitor is a structure called a *resource object*. The resource object is a pluggable library of target-specific configuration data and methods that allows the monitor code-base to remain independent from the analysis target to which it is deployed (Section III-B). Customizing and dynamically configuring an EMERALD monitor thus becomes




Fig. 1. The Generic EMERALD Monitor Architecture

a question of building and defining the fields of the analysis target's resource object.

Interoperability is especially critical to EMERALD's decentralized monitoring scheme, and extends within EMERALD's own architectural scope as well as to third-party modules. To support interoperability, EMERALD monitors incorporate a bidirectional messaging system. Section III-F discusses our efforts to develop a standard interface specification for communication within and between EMERALD monitors and external modules. Using this interface specification, third-party modules can communicate with EMERALD monitors in a variety of ways, as illustrated in Figure 1. Third-party modules operating as event-collection units may employ EMERALD's external interfaces to submit event data to the analysis engines for processing. Such third-party modules would effectively replace the monitor's own event-collection methods (Section III-B). Third-party modules may also submit and receive analysis results via the resolver's external interfaces. This will allow third-party modules to incorporate the results from EMERALD monitors into their own surveillance efforts, or to contribute their results to the EMERALD analysis hierarchy. Lastly, the monitor's internal API allows third-party analysis engines to be linked directly into the monitor boundary.

All EMERALD monitors (service, domain, and enterprise) are implemented using the same monitor codebase. The EMERALD monitor architecture is designed generally enough to be deployed at various abstract layers in the network. The only differences between deployed monitors are their resource object definitions. This reusable software architecture is a major project asset, providing significant benefits to the implementation and maintenance efforts. The following sections briefly describe the various components that make up the EMERALD monitor architecture.

B. Resource Objects: Abstracting Network Entities

Fundamental to EMERALD's design is the abstraction of the semantics of the analysis target from the EMERALD monitor. By logically decoupling the implementation of the EMERALD monitor from the analysis semantics of the analysis target, the extension of EMERALD's surveillance capabilities becomes a question of integration rather than implementation. The resource object contains all the operating parameters for each of the monitor's components as well as the analysis semantics (e.g., the profiler engine's measure and category definition, or the signature engine's penetration rule-base) necessary to process the target event stream. Once the resource object for a particular analysis target

is defined, it may be reused later by other EMERALD monitors that are deployed to equivalent analysis targets. For example, the resource object for a domain's router may be reused as other EMERALD monitors are deployed for other routers in the domain. A library of resource object definitions is being developed for commonly available network surveillance targets.

Figure 2 illustrates the general structure of the resource object. The resource object provides a pluggable configuration module for tuning the generic monitor code-base to a specific analysis target event stream. It minimally comprises the following variables (these variables may be extended as needed to accommodate the incorporation of new analysis engines into the monitor boundary):




Fig. 2. The Generic EMERALD Monitor Architecture

- Configurable Event Structures:** The monitor code-base maintains no internal dependence on the content or format of any given target event stream or the analysis results produced from analyzing the event stream. Rather, the resource object provides a universally applicable syntax for specifying the structure of event records and analysis results. Event records are defined based on the contents of the monitor's target event stream(s). Analysis result structures are used to package the findings produced by the analysis engine. Event records and analysis results are defined similarly to allow the eventual hierarchical processing of analysis results as event records by subscriber monitors.

- Event-Collection Methods:** A set of filtering routines (or log conversion routines with custom filtering semantics) is employed by the analysis engines to gather and format target-specific event records. These are the native methods that interact directly with the system to parse the target event stream.

- Engine N Configuration:** This refers to a col-

lection of variables and data structures that specifies the operating configuration of a fielded monitor's analysis engine(s). The resource object maintains a separate collection of operating parameters for each analysis engine instantiated within the monitor boundary.

- Analysis Unit N Configuration:** Each analysis engine maintains an independently configured collection of intrusion-detection analysis procedures. This structure contains the configuration variables that define the semantics employed by the analysis engine to process the target-specific event stream.

- Resolver Configuration:** The resource object maintains the operating parameters that specify the configuration of the resolver's internal modules.

- Decision Unit Configuration:** This refers to the semantics used by the resolver's decision unit for merging the analysis results from the various analysis engines. The semantics include the response criteria used by the decision unit for invoking countermeasure handlers.

- Subscription List:** This structure contains information necessary for establishing subscription-based communication sessions, which may include network address information and public keys used by the monitor to authenticate potential clients and servers. The subscription list field is an important facility for gaining visibility into malicious or anomalous activity outside the immediate environment of an EMERALD monitor. The most obvious examples where relationships are important involve interdependencies among network services that make local policy decisions. Consider, for example, the interdependencies between access checks performed during network file system mounting and the IP mapping of the DNS service. An unexpected mount monitored by the network file system service may be responded to differently if the DNS monitor informs the network file system monitor of suspicious updates to the mount requestor's DNS mapping.

- Valid Response Methods:** Various response functions can be made available to the resolver as it receives intrusion reports from its analysis engines or intrusion summaries from subscribers. These are pre-programmed countermeasure methods that the resolver may invoke as intrusion summaries are received.

As discussed above, the fields of the resource object are defined and utilized during monitor initialization. In addition, these fields may be modified by internal monitor components, and by authorized external clients using the monitor's API. Once fields are modified, components can be requested to dynamically reload the configuration parameters defined in those fields. This gives EMERALD an important ability to provide adaptive

analysis a control functionality. However, it also introduces a potential stability problem if dynamic modifications are not tightly restricted to avoid cyclic modifications. To address this issue, monitors accept configuration requests from only immediate parents in EMERALD's analysis hierarchy.

C. Scalable Profile-Based Anomaly Detection

The original groundwork for SRI's IDES effort was performed over a decade ago. The first-generation statistics component was used to analyze System Management Facility (SMF) records from an IBM mainframe system [10] in the first half of the 1980s. Requirements for an anomaly-detection system that became IDES were documented in [8]. This research led to the development of the NIDES statistical profile-based anomaly-detection subsystem (NIDES/Stats), which employed a wide range of multivariate statistical measures to profile the behavior of individual users [9]. Analysis is user-based, where a statistical score is assigned to each user's session representing how closely currently observed usage corresponds to the established patterns of usage for that individual. The input source to the NIDES statistical component is an unfiltered and unsorted host audit log, which represents the activity of all users currently operating on the host.

In 1995, SRI conducted research under Trusted Information Systems' Safeguard project to extend NIDES/Stats to profile the behavior of individual applications [2]. Statistical measures were customized to measure and differentiate the proper operation of an application from operation that may indicate Trojan horse substitution. Under the Safeguard model, analysis is application-based, where a statistical score is assigned to the operation of applications and represents the degree to which current behavior of the application corresponds to its established patterns of operation. The Safeguard effort demonstrated the ability of statistical profiling tools to clearly differentiate the scope of execution among general-purpose applications. It also showed that statistical analyses can be very effective in analyzing activities other than individual users; by instead monitoring applications, the Safeguard analysis greatly reduced the required number of profiles and computational requirements, and also dramatically decreased the typical false-positive and false-negative ratios.

While NIDES/Stats has been reasonably successful profiling users and later applications, it will be extended to the more general subject class typology required by EMERALD. Nonetheless, the underlying mechanisms are well suited to the problem of network anomaly detection, with some adaptation. The required modifications center around extensive reworking

of NIDES/Stats to abstract and generalize its definition of measures and profiles, the streamlining of its profile management, and the adaptation of the configuration and reporting mechanisms to EMERALD's highly interoperable and dynamic message system interface.

The EMERALD profiler engine achieves total separation between profile management and the mathematical algorithms used to assess the anomaly of events. Profiles are provided to the computational engine as classes defined in the resource object. The mathematical functions for anomaly scoring, profile maintenance, and updating function in a fully general manner, not requiring any underlying knowledge of the data being analyzed beyond what is encoded in the profile class. The event-collection interoperability supports translation of elementary data (the analysis target's event stream) to the profile and measure classes. At that point, analysis for different types of monitored entities is mathematically similar. This approach imparts great flexibility to the analysis in that fading memory constants, update frequency, measure type, and so on are tailored to the entity being monitored.

Each profiler engine is dedicated to a specific target event stream at the elementary level. Such localized, target-specific analyses (unlike the monolithic approach employed by NIDES/Stats) provide a more distributed, building-block approach to monitoring, and allow profiling computations to be efficiently dispersed throughout the network. Because the event stream submitted to the profiler engine is specific to the analysis target's activity, profile management is greatly simplified, in that there is no need to support multisubject profile instantiations.

In addition, the results of service-layer profiler engines can be propagated to other monitors operating higher in EMERALD's layered analysis scheme, offering domain- or enterprise-wide statistical profiling of anomaly reports. Profiler engines may operate throughout the analysis hierarchy, further correlating and merging service-layer profiles to identify more widespread anomalous activity. The underlying mathematics are the same for each instance, and all required information specific to the entity being monitored (be it a network resource or other EMERALD monitors producing analysis results at lower layers in the analysis hierarchy) is entirely encapsulated in the objects of the profile class.

D. Scalable Signature Analysis

Signature analysis is a process whereby an event stream is mapped against abstract representations of event sequences that are known to indicate undesirable activity. However, simplistic event binding alone may not necessarily provide enough indication to ensure the

accurate detection of the target activity. Signature analyzers must also distinguish whether an event sequence being witnessed is actually transitioning the system into the anticipated compromised state. Additionally, determining whether a given event sequence is indicative of an attack may be a function of the preconditions under which the event sequence is performed. To enable this finer granularity of signature recognition, previous efforts have employed various degrees of state detection and management logic (one such example is found in [18]). However, as discussed in Section II, the incorporation of sophisticated rule- and state-management features must be balanced with the need to ensure an acceptable level of performance.

In many respects, EMERALD's signature-analysis strategy departs from previous centralized rule-based efforts. EMERALD employs a highly distributed analysis strategy that, with respect to signature analysis, effectively modularizes and distributes the rule-base and inference engine into smaller, more focused signature engines. This has several benefits beyond the performance advantages from evenly distributing the computational load across network resources.

By narrowing the scope of activity in the event stream to a single analysis target, the noise ratio from event records that the signature engine must filter out is greatly reduced. This noise filtering of the event stream helps the signature engine avoid misguided searches along incorrect signature paths. EMERALD also partitions and distributes the signature activity representations. Rather than maintaining a central knowledge-base containing representations of all known malicious activity across a given computing environment, EMERALD distributes a tailored set of signature activity with each monitor's resource object.

EMERALD's signature-analysis objectives depend on which layer in EMERALD's hierarchical analysis scheme the signature engine operates. Service-layer signature engines attempt to monitor network services and infrastructure for attempts to subvert or misuse these components to penetrate or interfere with the domain's operation. Service monitors target external and perhaps unauthenticated individuals who attempt to subvert services or domain components to perform actions outside their normal operating scope. The EMERALD signature engine scans the event stream for events that represent attempted exploitations of known attacks against the service, or other activity that stands alone as warranting a response from the EMERALD monitor.

Above the service layer, signature engines scan the aggregate of intrusion reports from service monitors in an attempt to detect more global coordinated attack scenarios or scenarios that exploit interdependencies

among network services. The DNS/NFS attack discussed in Section III-B is one such example of an aggregate attack scenario. The fault-propagation model presented in [20] offers a general example of modeling interdependency of network assets (in this case fault interdependencies in a nonmalicious environment) that is also of general relevance for EMERALD's domain- and enterprise-layer intrusion correlation.

E. A Universal Resolver: Correlation and Response

EMERALD maintains a well-defined separation between analysis activities and response logic. Implementation of the response policy, including coordinating the dissemination of the analysis results, is the responsibility of the EMERALD resolver. The resolver is an expert system that receives the intrusion and suspicion reports produced by the profiler and signature engines, and based on these reports invokes the various response handlers defined within the resource object. Because the volume of intrusion and suspicion reports is lower than the individual event reports received by the analysis engines, the resolver can afford the more sophisticated demands of maintaining the configuration, and managing the response handling and external interfaces necessary for monitor operation. Furthermore, the resolver adds to the extensibility of EMERALD by providing the subscription interface through which third-party analysis tools can interact and participate in EMERALD's layered analysis scheme.

Upon its initialization, the resolver references various fields within the associated resource object. The resolver initiates authentication and subscription sessions with those EMERALD monitors whose identities appear in the resource object's subscription-list field. It also handles all incoming requests by subscribers, which must authenticate themselves to the resolver. (Details of EMERALD's subscription-session authentication process are discussed in [19].) Once a subscription session is established with a subscriber monitor, the resolver acts as the primary interface through which configuration requests are received, probes are handled, and intrusion reports are disseminated.

EMERALD supports extensive intermonitor sharing of analysis results throughout its layered analysis architecture. Resolvers are able to request and receive intrusion reports from other resolvers at lower layers in the analysis hierarchy. As analysis results are received from subscribers, they are forwarded via the monitor's event filters to the analysis engines. This tiered collection and correlation of analysis results allows EMERALD monitors to represent and profile more global malicious or anomalous activity that is not visible from the local monitoring of individual network services and assets.

(see Section IV).

In addition to its external-interface responsibilities, the resolver operates as a fully functional decision engine, capable of invoking real-time countermeasures in response to malicious or anomalous activity reports produced by the analysis engines. Countermeasures are defined in the response-methods field of the resource object. Included with each valid response method are evaluation metrics for determining the circumstances under which the method should be dispatched. These response criteria involve two evaluation metrics: a threshold metric that corresponds to the measure values and scores produced by the profiler engine, and severity metrics correspond to subsets of the associated attack sequences defined within the resource object. The resolver combines the metrics to formulate its monitor's response policy. Aggressive responses may include direct countermeasures such as closing connections or terminating processes. More passive responses may include the dispatching of integrity-checking handlers to verify the operating state of the analysis target.

The resolver operates as the center of intramonitor communication. As the analysis engines build intrusion and suspicion reports, they propagate these reports to the resolver for further correlation, response, and dissemination to other EMERALD monitors. The resolver can also submit runtime configuration requests to the analysis engines, possibly to increase or decrease the scope of analyses (e.g., enable or disable additional signature rules) based on various operating metrics. These configuration requests could be made as a result of encountering other intrusion reports from other subscribers. For example, an intrusion report produced by a service monitor in one domain could be propagated to an enterprise monitor, which in turn sensitizes service monitors in other domains to the same activity.

Lastly, a critical function of the EMERALD resolver is to operate as the interface mechanism between the monitor administrator and the monitor itself. From the perspective of an EMERALD resolver, the administrator interface is simply a subscribing service to which the resolver may submit its intrusion summaries and receive probes and configuration requests. The administrative interface tool can dynamically subscribe and unsubscribe to any of the deployed EMERALD resolvers, as well as submit configuration requests and asynchronous probes as desired.

F. The EMERALD Message System

Interoperability is especially critical to the EMERALD design, which from conception promotes dynamic extensibility through a building-block approach to scal-

able network surveillance. EMERALD monitors incorporate a duplex messaging system that allows them to correlate activity summaries and countermeasure information in a distributed hierarchical analysis framework. EMERALD's messaging system must address interoperability both within its own architectural scope and with other third-party analysis tools. To do this, the messaging system provides a well-defined programmer's interface that supports the bidirectional exchange of analysis results and configuration requests with alternative security tools.

EMERALD's message system operates under an asynchronous communication model for handling results dissemination and processing that is generically referred to as subscription-based message passing.² EMERALD component interoperation is client/server-based, where a client module may subscribe to receive event data or analysis results from servers. Once the subscription request is accepted by the server, the server module forwards events or analysis results to the client automatically as data becomes available, and may dynamically reconfigure itself as requested by the client's control requests. While this asynchronous model does not escape the overhead needed to ensure reliable delivery, it does reduce the need for client probes and acknowledgments.

An important goal in the design of EMERALD's interface specification is that the interface remain as implementation neutral as possible. To support an implementation-neutral communication framework, the message system is designed with strong separation between the programmer's interface specification and the issues of message transport.³ The interface specification embodies no assumptions about the target intrusion-detection modules, implementation languages, host platform, or network. The transport layer is architecturally isolated from the internals of EMERALD monitors so that transport modules may be readily introduced and replaced as protocols and security requirements are negotiated between module developers. The following briefly summarizes EMERALD's interface specification and transport layer design.

Interface Specification: Interface specification involves the definition of the messages that the various intrusion-detection modules must convey to one another, and how these messages should be processed. The message structure and content are specified in a completely implementation-neutral context. Internally, EMERALD monitors contain three general module types: event collection methods that collect and fil-

² Other communities have employed subscription-based push/pull data flow schemes for information such as network management traffic and WWW content.

³ Details of EMERALD's programmer's interface specification and transport design are provided in [10].

ter the target event stream, analysis engines that process the filtered events, and a resolver that processes and responds to the analysis engine results. Externally, EMERALD monitors interoperate with one another in a manner analogous to internal communication: service monitors produce local analysis results that are passed to the domain monitor; domain monitors correlate service monitor results, producing new results that are further propagated to enterprise monitors; enterprise monitors correlate and respond to the analysis results produced by domain monitors.

Both intramonitor and intermonitor communication employ identical subscription-based client-server models. With respect to intermonitor communication, the resolver operates as a client to the analysis engines, and the analysis engines operate as clients to the event filters. Through the internal message system, the resolver submits configuration requests and probes to the analysis engines, and receives from the analysis engines their analysis results. The analysis engines operate as servers providing the resolver with intrusion or suspicion reports either asynchronously or upon request. Similarly, the analysis engines are responsible for establishing and maintaining a communication link with a target event collection method (or event filter) and prompting the reconfiguration of the collection method's filtering semantics when necessary. Event collection methods provide analysis engines with target-specific event records upon which the statistical and signature analyses are performed.

Intermonitor communication also operates using the subscription-based hierarchy. A domain monitor subscribes to the analysis results produced by service monitors, and then propagates its own analytical results to its parent enterprise monitor. The enterprise monitor operates as a client to one or more domain monitors, allowing them to correlate and model enterprise-wide activity from the domain-layer results. Domain monitors operate as servers to the enterprise monitors, and as clients to the service-layer monitors deployed throughout their local domain. This message scheme would operate identically if correlation were to continue at higher layers of abstraction beyond enterprise analysis.

EMERALD's intramonitor and intermonitor programming interfaces are identical. These interfaces are subdivided into five categories of interoperation: channel initialization and termination, channel synchronization, dynamic configuration, server probing, and report/event dissemination. Clients are responsible for initiating and terminating channel sessions with servers. Furthermore, clients are responsible for managing channel synchronization in the event of errors in message sequencing or periods of failed or slow response (i.e.,

"I'm alive" confirmations). Clients may also submit dynamic configuration requests to servers. For example, an analysis engine may request an event collection method to modify its filtering semantics. Clients may also probe servers for report summaries or additional event information. Lastly, servers may send clients intrusion/suspicion summaries or event data in response to client probes or in an asynchronous dissemination mode.

Transport Layer: The second part of the message system framework involves the specification of the transport mechanism used to establish a given communication channel between monitors or possibly between a monitor and a third-party security module. All implementation dependencies within the message system framework are addressed by the pluggable transport modules. Transport modules are specific to the participating intrusion-detection modules, their respective hosts, and potentially to the network—should the modules require cross-platform interoperation. Part of the integration of a monitor into a new analysis target is the incorporation of the necessary transport module(s) (for both internal and external communication).

It is at the transport layer where EMERALD addresses issues of communications security, integrity, and reliability. While it is important to facilitate interoperability among security mechanisms, this interoperability must be balanced with the need to ensure an overall level of operational integrity, reliability, and privacy. An essential element in the EMERALD messaging system design is the integration of secure transport to ensure a degree of internal security between EMERALD components and other cooperative analysis units.

The transport modules that handle intramonitor communication may be different from the transport modules that handle intermonitor communication. This allows the intramonitor transport modules to address security and reliability issues differently than how the intermonitor transport modules address security and reliability. While intramonitor communication may more commonly involve interprocess communication within a single host, intermonitor communication will most commonly involve cross-platform networked interoperation. For example, the intramonitor transport mechanisms may employ unnamed pipes [14], which provides a kernel-enforced private interprocess communication channel between the monitor components (this assumes a process hierarchy within the monitor architecture). The monitor's external transport, however, will more likely export data through untrusted network connections and thus require more extensive security management. To ensure the security and integrity of the message exchange, the external transport may employ

public/private key authentication protocols and session key exchange. Using this same interface, third-party analysis tools may authenticate and exchange analysis results and configuration information with EMERALD monitors in a well-defined, secure manner.

The pluggable transport allows EMERALD flexibility in negotiating security features and protocol usage with third parties. Of particular interest to the monitoring of network events is our planned incorporation of a commercially available network management system as a third-party module. That system will deliver monitoring results relating to security, reliability, availability, performance, and other attributes. The network management system may in turn subscribe to EMERALD results in order to influence network reconfiguration. This experiment will demonstrate the interoperation of intrusion-detection instrumentation with analysis tools that themselves do not specifically address security management.

IV. EMERALD NETWORK DEPLOYMENT

The EMERALD reusable-monitor architecture provides a framework for the organization and coordination of distributed event analysis across multiple administrative domains. EMERALD introduces a service-oriented, layered approach to representing, analyzing, and responding to network misuse. EMERALD's profiling and signature analyses are not performed as monolithic analyses over an entire domain, but rather are deployed sparingly throughout a large enterprise to provide focused protection of key network assets vulnerable to attack. This model leads to greater flexibility whenever the network configuration changes dynamically, and to improved performance, where computational load is distributed efficiently among network resources.

Domains under EMERALD surveillance are able to detect malicious activity targeted against their network services and infrastructure, and disseminate this information in a coordinated and secure way to other EMERALD monitors (as well as third-party analysis tools) distributed throughout the network. Reports of problems found in one domain can propagate to other monitors throughout the network using the subscription process. EMERALD's subscription-based communication strategy provides mutual authentication between participants, as well as confidentiality and integrity for all intermonitor message traffic (see Section III-F).

EMERALD's analysis scheme is highly composable, beginning at the service layer where EMERALD monitors analyze the security-relevant activity associated with an individual network service or network infrastructure. As service-layer monitors detect activity that

indicates possible misuse, this information is responded to by the monitor's local resolver to ensure immediate response. Misuse reports are also disseminated throughout EMERALD's web of surveillance, to the monitor's pool of subscribers.

Domain-layer monitors model and profile domain-wide vulnerabilities not detectable from the narrow visibility of the service layer. Domain monitors search for intrusive and anomalous activity across a group of interdependent service-layer components, subscribing to each service's associated service monitor. Domain monitors also operate as the dissemination point between the domain's surveillance and the external network surveillance. Where mutual trust among domains exists, domain monitors may establish peer relationships with one another. Peer-to-peer subscription allows domain monitors to share intrusion summaries from events that have occurred in other domains. Domain monitors may use such reports to dynamically sensitize their local service monitors to malicious activity found to be occurring outside the domain's visibility. Domain monitors may also operate within an enterprise hierarchy, where they disseminate intrusion reports to enterprise monitors for global correlation. Where trust exists between domains, peer-to-peer subscription provides a useful technique for keeping domains sensitized to malicious activity occurring outside their view.

Enterprise-layer monitors attempt to model and detect coordinated efforts to infiltrate domain perimeters or prevent interconnectivity between domains. Enterprise surveillance may be used where domains are interconnected under the control of a single organization, such as a large privately owned WAN. Enterprise surveillance is very similar to domain surveillance: the enterprise monitor subscribes to various domain monitors, just as the domain monitors subscribed to various local service monitors. The enterprise monitor (or monitors, as it would be important to avoid centralizing any analysis) focuses on network-wide threats such as Internet worm-like attacks, attacks repeated against common network services across domains, or coordinated attacks from multiple domains against a single domain. As an enterprise monitor recognizes commonalities in intrusion reports across domains (e.g., the spreading of a worm or a mail system attack repeated throughout the enterprise), its resolver can take steps to help domains counter the attack, and can also help sensitize other domains to such attacks before they are affected.

EMERALD's distributed analysis paradigm provides several significant performance advantages over the centralized signature analysis and statistical profiling tools from which its architecture is derived. In a large network, event activity is dispersed throughout its spa-

tially distributed components, occurring in parallel and in volumes that are difficult for centralized analysis tools to manage. EMERALD distributes the computational load and space utilization needed to monitor the various network components, and performs its analysis and response activity locally. Local detection and response also helps to ensure timely protection of network assets. Furthermore, EMERALD's distributed monitor deployment effectively parallelizes the statistical profiling and signature analyses. Once the event streams from the various analysis targets are separated and submitted to the deployed monitors, event correlation, profiling, and response handling are all managed by independent computational units. Lastly, EMERALD's dynamic extensibility allows an integrator to selectively choose the key elements in a network that require monitoring, and the ability to alter analysis coverage dynamically.

V. RELATED WORK

EMERALD is not intended as a replacement to more centralized, host-based, user-oriented intrusion-detection tools, but rather as a complementary architecture that addresses threats from the interconnectivity of domains in hostile environments. Specifically, EMERALD attempts to detect and respond to both anticipated and unanticipated misuses of services and infrastructure in large network-based enterprises, including external threats that attempt to subvert or bypass a domain's network interfaces and control mechanisms to gain unauthorized access to domain resources or prevent the availability of these resources. EMERALD also provides a framework for recognizing more global threats to interdomain connectivity, including coordinated attempts to infiltrate or destroy connectivity across an entire network enterprise. A more detailed discussion of EMERALD's relationship with other work is given in [19]. Here, we merely allude to its position in the spectrum of research in intrusion detection, fault detection, and alarm correlation.

A. Related Intrusion Detection Research

EMERALD considerably generalizes and extends the earlier pioneering work of SRI's IDES and NIDES [1], overcoming previous limitations with respect to scalability, applicability to networking, interoperability, and inability to detect distributed coordinated attacks. It generalizes to network environments the Safeguard experience [2], which overcame profile explosion and scalability problems by locally profiling the activities of subsystems and commands rather than of individual users. EMERALD also extends the statistical-profile model of NIDES, to analyze the operation of network services, network infrastructure, and activity reports from other

EMERALD monitors. Various other efforts have considered one of the two types of analysis - signature-based (e.g., Porras [18] has used a state-transition approach; the U.C. Davis and Trident DIDS [4] addresses abstracted analysis for networking, but not scalability; the Network Security Monitor [7] seeks to analyze packet data rather than conventional audit trails; Purdue [6] seeks to use adaptive-agent technology) or profile-based. More recent work in UC Davis' GrIDS effort [24] employs activity graphs of network operations to search for traffic patterns that may indicate network-wide coordinated attacks. (Ko has considered writing specifications for expected behavior [13], which is sort of a compromise between signature analysis and behavioral profiling.)

B. Related Research in Fault Detection

EMERALD is somewhat similar conceptually to various efforts in alarm correlation and high-volume event correlation/fault detection in the network management community [8], [15], [16]. EMERALD's architecture and layered analysis is somewhat similar to the distributed event correlation system (DECS) discussed in [12]. However, DECS makes several simplifications in its stateless event modeling scheme that do not translate well to a malicious environment for detecting intrusions. Recent work in nonmalicious fault isolation [20] is also relevant, and is being considered. However, none of these efforts shares EMERALD's abilities for recursive hierarchical abstraction and misuse detection, nor do they include provisions to ensure their own survivability in hostile environments.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper introduces EMERALD, a composable surveillance and response architecture oriented toward the monitoring of distributed network elements. EMERALD targets external threat agents who attempt to subvert or bypass network interfaces and controls to gain unauthorized access to domain resources. EMERALD builds a multiple local monitoring capability into a framework for coordinating the dissemination of distributed analyses to provide global detection and response to network-wide coordinated attacks. The basic analysis unit in this architecture is the EMERALD monitor, which incorporates both signature analysis and statistical profiling. By separating the analysis semantics from the analysis and response logic, EMERALD monitors can be easily integrated throughout EMERALD's layered network surveillance strategy.

EMERALD builds on and considerably extends past research and development in anomaly and misuse detection, to accommodate the monitoring of large dis-

tributed systems and networks. Because the real-time analysis itself can be distributed and applied where most effective at different layers of abstraction, EMERALD has significant advantages over more centralized approaches in terms of event detectability and response capabilities, and yet can be computationally realistic. It can detect not only local attacks, but also coordinated attacks such as distributed denials of service. The EMERALD design addresses interoperability within its own scope, and in so doing enables its interoperability with other analysis platforms as well. EMERALD's inherent generality and flexibility in terms of what is being monitored and how the analysis is accomplished suggests that the design can be readily extended to monitoring other attributes such as survivability, fault tolerance, and assured availability.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Anderson, T. Privois, and A. Valdes. Next-generation intrusion-detection expert system (NIDES). Technical report, Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, SRI-CSL-85-07, May 1985.
- [2] D. Anderson, T. Lunt, H. Javitz, A. Tamari, and A. Valdes. Safeguard final report: Detecting unusual program behavior using the NIDES statistical component. Technical report, Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, 2 December 1993.
- [3] J.P. Anderson. Computer security technology planning study. Technical Report ESD-TR-73-51, ESD/AFSC, Hanscom AFB, Bedford, MA, October 1972.
- [4] J. Brentano, S.R. Snapp, G.V. Diaz, T.L. Goan, L.T. Heberlein, C.H. Ho, K.N. Levitt, and B. Mukherjee. An architecture for a distributed intrusion detection system. In *Fifteenth Department of Energy Computer Security Group Conference*, pages 25–45 in section 17, Concord, CA, May 1991. Department of Energy.
- [5] M. Crook and E.H. Spafford. Active defense of a computer system using autonomous agents. Technical report, Department of Computer Sciences, CSD-TR-93-008, Purdue University, West Lafayette IN, 1993.
- [6] D.E. Denning and P.G. Neumann. Requirements and model for IDES – a real-time intrusion-detection expert system. Technical report, Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, August 1985.
- [7] T.L. Heberlein, B. Mukherjee, and K.N. Levitt. A method to detect intrusive activity in a networked environment. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth National Computer Security Conference*, pages 363–371, Washington, D.C., 1–4 October 1991. NIST/NCSA.
- [8] G. Jakobson and M.D. Weisman. Alarm correlation. *IEEE Network*, pages 52–59, November 1993.
- [9] H.S. Javitz and A. Valdes. The NIDES statistical component description and justification. Technical report, Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, March 1984.
- [10] H.S. Javitz, A. Valdes, D.E. Denning, and P.G. Neumann. Analytical techniques development for a statistical intrusion-detection system (SIDDS) based on accounting records. Technical report, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, July 1986.
- [11] P.M. Joyal. Industrial espionage today and information war of tomorrow. In *National Information Systems Security Conference*, Baltimore, Maryland, pages 139–150, Washington, D.C., 22–25 October 1990.
- [12] S. Kliger, S. Yemini, Y. Yemini, D. Oshale, and S. Stolfo. A coding approach to event correlation. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Integrated Network Management (IFIP/IEEE)*, Santa Barbara, CA, May 1995, pages 266–277. Chapman & Hall, London, England, 1995.
- [13] O. Ko, M. Ruschitska, and K. Levitt. Execution monitoring of security-critical programs in distributed systems: A specification-based approach. In *Proceedings of the 1997 Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 175–187, Oakland, CA, May 1997. IEEE Computer Society.
- [14] D. Lewine. *POSIX Programmer's Guide*. O'Reilly and Associates incorporated, 1991.
- [15] M. Manaouri-Samanli and M. Sloman. Monitoring distributed systems. *IEEE Network*, pages 20–30, November 1993.
- [16] K. Meyer, M. Erlinger, J. Betsae, C. Sunahine, G. Goldsamt, and Y. Yemini. Decentralizing control and intelligence in network management. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Integrated Network Management (IFIP/IEEE)*, Santa Barbara, CA, May 1995, pages 4–16. Chapman & Hall, London, England, 1995.
- [17] P.G. Neumann. *Computer-Related Risks*. ACM Press, New York, and Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1994. ISBN 0-201-56805-X.
- [18] P.A. Porras and R.A. Kemmerer. Penetration state transition analysis: A rule-based intrusion detection approach. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (San Antonio, TX, Nov. 30-Dec. 4)*, pages 220–229. IEEE, 1992.
- [19] P.A. Porras and P.G. Neumann. Conceptual design and planning for EMERALD: event monitoring enabling responses to anomalous live disturbances. Technical report, Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, October 1997. Available for download via <http://www.cal.sri.com/intrusion.html>.
- [20] L. Ricciulli and N. Shacham. Modelling correlated alarms in network management systems. *Communications Networks and Distributed Systems Modeling and Simulation*, 1997.
- [21] J.A. Rochlin and M.W. Elkin. With microscope and tweezers: The Worm from MIT's perspective. *Communications of the ACM*, 32(6):660–666, June 1989.
- [22] E. Rosen. Vulnerabilities of network control protocols. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 6(1):5–8, January 1981.
- [23] B.H. Spafford. The Internet Worm: trials and aftermath. *Communications of the ACM*, 32(6):678–687, June 1989.
- [24] S. Stanford-Chen, S. Cheung, R. Crawford, J. Frank M. Dillon, J. Hoagland, K. Levitt, C. Wei, R. Yip, and D. Zerkel. Grids—a graph based intrusion detection system for large networks. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth National Information Systems Security Conference*, pages 361–370, October 1996.

EXHIBIT K

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

C.A:04-1199 (SLR)

SRI INTERNATIONAL, INC.,)
a California Corporation)
Plaintiff and)
Counterclaim Defendant,)
v.)
INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,)
a Delaware Corporation, INTERNET)
SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., a Georgia)
Corporation, and SYMANTEC)
CORPORATION, a Delaware)
Corporation,)
Defendants and)
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs.)
- - - - -

COPY

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION

OF

Y. FRANK JOU

At Raleigh, North Carolina
January 27, 2006 - 9:53 a.m.

Reported by:
Debra D. Bowden

capitalreporting

PO Box 97696
Raleigh, NC 27624

www.capreporting.com

8360 Six Forks Road
Suite 101
Raleigh, NC 27615

capreporting@aol.com

919.398.7775 ph
919 398.7741 fax

1 Q. Now, while your DARPA project was limited
2 in time and funding, did you create the
3 design such that it could be extended in
4 this hierarchical fashion?

5 A. I would not say created, because the SNMP
6 network by its nature is to monitor remote
7 system.

8 Q. Um-hmm.

9 A. And be able to reflect a healthy -- the
10 healthy -- the status of the network, you
11 know, it's healthy, whether it's healthy or
12 it's, you know, under stress. That was the
13 intent of the SNMP framework. And our
14 thinking at that point in time was to take
15 advantage of this SNMP by the fact that
16 it's able to monitor several systems in a
17 distributive fashion. And you know, the
18 challenge at that point was how do you
19 correlate. I think that was the main
20 technical challenge at that point in time
21 in terms of how do you collect -- collect
22 of the local detection result was not an
23 issue. The issue was how do you come up
24 with the intelligence, how do you correlate

1 all the relevant information and be able
2 to, you know, derive a certain logical or
3 reasonable conclusion, and able to, based
4 upon this result, take action accordingly.
5 I think that was the challenge, and the --
6 you know, we did look into that aspect.
7 But however at that point we did not have a
8 very promising, you know, development at
9 that time. At the conclusion of the
10 project. So that was, you know, the open
11 question at that point.

12 Q. And if you just saw the term correlate --

13 A. Um-hmm.

14 Q. -- what would that mean to you?

15 MS. PRESCOTT: Objection to form.

16 A. Correlate means how do you put two or more
17 than two input together and derive
18 meaningful information, or intelligence,
19 out of these different infrastreams of
20 information, and be able to come up with
21 certain rationale or logic that what this,
22 you know, behavior manifests to itself.

23 Probably that's kind of lengthy or
24 wordy, but that's my understanding of this

174

1 word, correlation.

2 MS. MOEHLMAN: Okay, let me go off
3 the record for two minutes.

4 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record,
5 the time is 15:31.

6 (Continuing after recess.)

7 VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record,
8 the time is 1534.

9 MS. MOEHLMAN: Thank you very much
10 for your time today. We are concluded.

11 THE WITNESS: Okay. My pleasure.

12 VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes volume
13 one of the deposition of Y. Frank Jou. The
14 videographer was Bob Collier for the firm
15 of Capital Reporting of Raleigh, North
16 Carolina. The deposition was held at the
17 offices of Smith Moore, Raleigh, North
18 Carolina, on January 27th, 2006. The
19 number of tapes used was three. The time
20 is 15:34.

21 [DEPOSITION CONCLUDED]

22

23

24